

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-15, 17-18, and 20-25 are pending in the above-identified application, and were rejected. With this amendment, no claims were amended, added or cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-15, 17-18, and 20-25 are at issue.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-13, 15, 17, 18, and 20-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Doyle (U.S. Patent No. 6,128,738). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to an access control system for use in a data transfer system which transfers data by means of public-key cryptosystem based on a public key certificate issued to an authentication object by a public key issuer authority. The access control system comprises a service provider, which is an authentication object and which provides services, a service receiving device, which also is an authentication object and which receives services provided by the service provider, and an access control server which issues to the service receiving device an access permission, which identifies a service provider an access to which by the service receiving device is permitted. The system holder which is an organization that provides or control contents usable by a user terminal, contents which enables provision of services, or a service distribution infrastructure. The service provider performs, based on the access permission, a decision as to whether an access request by the service receiving device is to be permitted and the system holder is configured to administrate the service provider and the service receiving device and to treat the service provider and the service receiving device as

authentication objects and generates the access permissions in a form independently usable for the service provider.

Doyle is directed to method and system for enabling a single client certificate to be used in SNA communications to ensure security such that the certificate cannot be intercepted and reused. (See Abstract). In Doyle, when the host receives the information about which host application is selected, the host application provides the information and a bind request 307 is sent from the host to the client. The client responds with a bind response 309. The host application then sends a request to the client for their certificate 311. The client then responds by creating a security packet and sending the security packet to the host 313 for authentication. The host application forwards the client's certificate to a host access control 315. The host access control returns a response to the host application 317. At that point, logon is complete and application data begins to flow 319 between the client and the host application. (Col. 1, line 67 - Col. 2, line 14). Thus, both the client and host application are required to store and administrate various kinds of data for authentication, increasing the load on each device. Examiner has stated Doyle (Col. 1, line 66 - Col. 2, line 15) discloses that the certificates and signatures created are usable for a plurality of services. However, Doyle requires distinct configuration and authentication for each host application. Doyle does not disclose or suggest generation of the access permissions in a form independently usable for the service provider. Accordingly, claim 1 and claims 2, 4-6, and 8-14, which depend from claim 1, are allowable over Doyle.

For reasons similar to those disclosed above with regard to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the independent claim 15 and claims 17-18 and 20-25, are also allowable over Doyle. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 14 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doyle (U.S. Patent No. 6,128,738) in view of Misra (U.S. Patent No. 5,757,920). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.


As discussed above, Doyle does not disclose or suggest generation of the access permissions in a form independently usable for the service provider. Thus, it would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention to modify the system/method to generate access permissions in a form independently usable for the service provider, as disclosed by Doyle, with the teachings of Misra to derive claim 14, which depends from claim 1, or to derive claim 25, which depend from claim 15. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully request early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 2, 2005

By: 
Marina N. Saito
Registration No. 42,121
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000